

Submitted to the Astronomical Journal

Parent Stars of Extrasolar Planets VII: New Abundance Analyses of 30 Systems

Chris Laws¹, Guillermo Gonzalez², Kyle M. Walker³, Sudhi Tyagi¹, Jeremy Dodsworth¹,
Keely Snider¹, Nicholas B. Suntzeff⁴

ABSTRACT

The results of new spectroscopic analyses of 30 stars with giant planet and/or brown dwarf companions are presented. Values for T_{eff} and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ are used in conjunction with *Hipparcos* data and Padova isochrones to derive masses, ages, and theoretical surface gravities. These new data are combined with spectroscopic and photometric metallicity estimates of other stars harboring planets and published samples of F, G, and K dwarfs to compare several subsets of planet bearing stars with similarly well-constrained control groups. The distribution of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values continues the trend uncovered in previous studies in that stars hosting planetary companions have a higher mean value than otherwise similar nearby stars. We also investigate the relationship between stellar mass and the presence of giant planets and find statistically marginal but suggestive evidence of a decrease in the incidence of radial velocity companions orbiting relatively less massive stars. If confirmed with larger samples, this would represent a critical constraint to both planetary formation models as well as to estimates of the distribution of planetary systems in our galaxy.

Subject headings: planetary systems - stars: individual (HD 4203, HD 4208, HD 6434, HD 8574, HD 16141, HD 19994, HD 22049, HD 27442, HD 28185, HD 33636, HD 37124, HD 46375, HD 50554, HD 68988, HD 82943, HD 83443, HD 95128, HD 106252, HD 108147, HD 114783, HD 117176, HD 121504, HD 136118, HD 141937, HD 160691, HD 168746, HD 169830, HD 190228, HD 195019A, HD 202206, HD 213240)

¹University of Washington, Astronomy Department, Box 351580, Seattle, WA 98195
laws@astro.washington.edu

²Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, gonzog@iastate.edu

³Department of Astronomy, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210

⁴Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, NOAO, Casilla 603, La Serena, Chile, nsuntzeff@noao.edu

1. Introduction

We have steadily reported the results of our spectroscopic analyses of stars-with-planets (hereafter, SWPs) in our series of studies on this topic (Gonzalez 1997, Paper I; Gonzalez 1998, Paper II; Gonzalez & Vanture 1998, Paper III; and Gonzalez et al. 1999, Paper IV; Gonzalez & Laws 2000, Paper V; Gonzalez et al. 2001, Paper VI), and continue this effort here with our most recent findings. Other similar studies include Fuhrmann et al. (1998), Santos et al. (2000, 2001a, 2002), Takeda et al. (2001), and Zhao et al. (2002). Such intensive, detailed, and persistent spectroscopic programs have been demanded by the observed correlations between chemical abundances and other characteristics among SWPs (c.f. Paper VI, Santos et al. 2002, Gonzalez 2003). By providing well-constrained stellar parameters for a homogeneously analyzed cohort of SWPs, we hope to provide further insight into these trends and to support research into the underlying physics which gives rise to them.

In Section 2 we discuss our program of observations, and in Section 3 we present a brief review of our analysis method and new results for 25 SWPs, along with updated parameters for 5 previously analyzed systems. Additionally, we report on HD 202206, which has been reported by Udry et al. (2002) to harbor a companion with a minimum mass of 17.5 M_J . In Section 4 we compare our findings both to similar spectroscopic studies and recently recalibrated photometric estimates, and examine several subsamples of SWPs and field stars with well-determined stellar parameters for potential trends in metallicity, Galactic orbits, and stellar mass. We also offer interpretations of these results in light of current theories of planetary system evolution. We briefly summarize the main conclusions and discuss the implications of our results in Section 5.

2. Sample and Observations

High-resolution, high S/N ratio spectra of 24 stars were obtained with the 2dcoude echelle spectrograph at the McDonald Observatory 2.7 m telescope using the same instrumental setup as described in Paper V. An additional set of 7 southern stars were observed over two nights using the echelle spectrograph of the CTIO 4 m Blanco telescope. Of these 31 targets, 25 were selected because they had been reported to harbor substellar companions (see Table 1 for details of the discovery papers), but had not been observed and analyzed by our group using the methods we have consistently employed on previously announced SWPs. These stars represented all of the known SWPs which were appropriate targets for our analysis, but which we had not studied as of the dates of observations. HD 202206 was also included in this set, although its companion’s minimum-mass estimate of 17.5 M_J suggests that it is more likely a brown dwarf than a planet. Two stars, HD 95128 and HD 117176,

which had been previously analyzed in Paper II using spectra from the McDonald Observatory 2.1 m telescope and the Sandiford cassegrain echelle, were observed again using the 2.7 m instrument combination. These repeat observations were made due both to the higher quality of spectra which could be obtained, as well as to increase the self-consistency of our SWP sample. We also obtained new spectra of HD 16141, HD 37124, and HD 46375, each of which we had previously analyzed in Paper VI using Keck spectra. The new spectra of these stars provides considerably expanded wavelength coverage, and allows us to employ our full atomic linelist in deriving results. Several spectra of hot stars with high $v \sin i$ values were also obtained on each night in order to divide out telluric lines in the McDonald and CTIO spectra. Table 1 presents additional details of the SWPs observations.

We employed the same data reduction methods for echelle images as those detailed in Paper V to produce one-dimensional spectra covering most of the visible spectrum. Equivalent widths (EWs) were measured for the same set of Fe I and Fe II lines presented in Paper VI; the results are presented in Tables 2 and 3.⁵ EWs were also measured for several additional elements, and those results will be reported in a subsequent paper.

3. Analysis

3.1. Spectroscopic Analysis

Our method of determining the stellar parameters T_{eff} , $\log g$, ξ_t , and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ is the same as that employed in our previous studies in this series, to which the reader is referred for more details. The results for our 31 program stars are given in Table 4.

Since we have not previously used the CTIO 4 m telescope for spectroscopic studies of SWPs, we need an independent check on the zero point of the derived $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values. A comparison of our CTIO-based metallicity results with the spectroscopic studies of Santos et al. (2000, 2001a) shows a mean offset of $\Delta[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -0.01$, which is the same result we find in comparing our entire McDonald-based SWPs sample to theirs. We therefore assume that the McDonald 2.7 m and CTIO 4 m spectra share a common zero point, and add no corrective offset to the CTIO-based results.

⁵These tables are available in the electronic version of this paper.

3.2. Derived Parameters

In previous papers in this series we have primarily employed the stellar evolutionary isochrones of Schaller et al. (1992) and Schaerer et al. (1993), along with the *Hipparcos* parallaxes (ESA 1997) and our spectroscopic T_{eff} estimates to determine masses, ages, and theoretical $\log g$ values.⁶ In this work we have chosen to alter this method slightly by using the more recent Padova isochrone set (cf. Girardi et al. 2000, Salasnich et al. 2000). This was done in order to eliminate the offsets in T_{eff} and M_v that we had found necessary to reproduce solar values in the Schaller and Schaerer isochrone set (see Paper II), and also in order to take advantage of the greater range of age, mass, and metallicity values covered by the Padova isochrone set.

As before, we used our spectroscopic T_{eff} and *Hipparcos* M_v values to determine a best fitting isochrone for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values above and below the spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ of the star in question. We then interpolated between these high- and low-metallicity isochrones to estimate values for each star’s age, mass, and theoretical $\log g$. In addition to performing this updated procedure on the 31 new spectroscopic results presented here, we re-analyzed all of the stars previously reported on in our SWPs series. This set of homogeneously derived evolutionary parameters for 58 SWPs is presented in Table 5, along with estimates of space velocities from *Hipparcos* data, and additional age estimates based on the stellar activity index, R'_{HK} .

Several of the stars in Table 5 deserve note. Due to its location in the H-R diagram, HD 8574 presents two close but unique and equally viable solutions for its derived parameters, at $[\text{Mass } (M_{\odot}), \text{Age (Gyr)}, \log g]$ values of $[1.16, 4.4, 4.20]$ or $[1.11, 5.6, 4.18]$. This degeneracy arises due to the overlap in this region of the H-R diagram of the Main Sequence and the post-main sequence blue “hook” of somewhat more massive stars.

An additional four stars - HD 6434, HD 37124, HD 46375, and HD 168746 - lie in regions of the H-R diagram which are too red and/or too luminous to be well fit by isochrones with appropriate metallicities and cosmologically reasonable ages. Figure 1 presents H-R diagrams of these four stars along with Padova isochrones of 14.1, 15.8 and 17.8 Gyr, selected to match as closely as possible our spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values for each star. Note that HD 6434 and HD 168746 are significantly more metal-poor than stars which would lie precisely on the isochrones presented – isochrones of the same ages but with proper, lower metallicities would have higher temperatures and lie further to the left on these plots.

⁶Note, the theoretical $\log g$ values are derived from theoretical stellar evolutionary isochrones at the age which agrees with the observed T_{eff} , M_v , and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values.

In contrast to the extreme ages predicted by the Padova isochrones, we note that while HD 6434 has a space velocity suggestive of old age, the other three stars evidence relatively modest space motions, and furthermore three of the four possess R'_{HK} values which indicate ages less than 5 Gyr (HD 168746 has no published R'_{HK} values). HD 37124 and HD 46375 have been previously identified as possible ‘red stragglers’ in Paper VI, and the very similar T_{eff} values we find in this work reinforce this claim. We have previously proposed that these stars might be overluminous due to the presence of unseen stellar companions; however, a recent adaptive optics search for nearby stellar companions to SWPs by Luhman and Jayawardhana (2002) failed to detect any accompanying objects capable of producing the necessary luminosity enhancements for HD 37124 or HD 46375. In light of these unusual and conflicting findings, we recommend that HD 6434 and HD 168746 also be examined for close stellar companions, and that all four of these ‘red stragglers’ be targeted for follow-up studies to determine the source of their unorthodox characteristics.

4. Discussion

4.1. Comparisons with Other Studies

Continuing efforts to characterize F, G, and K dwarfs in the solar neighborhood, as well as the considerable attention focused on the discovery and subsequent follow-up studies of SWPs themselves, have resulted in the development of multiple independently produced sets of spectroscopic and photometric estimates of basic stellar parameters for these objects. In the following subsections we compare our results to those of several recent studies.

4.1.1. Metallicity

Spectroscopic values of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ have been reported by Santos et al. (2000, 2001a, 2002) for most of the stars in the present study. In comparing $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values between the two sets, we find a mean difference of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{Here}} - [\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{Santos}} = -0.009 \pm 0.007$, with a standard deviation of 0.039. This very close agreement is not a complete surprise, given the considerable similarity in the analysis method used by our group and that of Santos et al., but is nevertheless an encouraging indicator of the consistency and precision of our results. Additional comparisons of our spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values for SWPs with those reported by several other investigators can be found in Gonzalez (2003).

Martell & Laughlin (2002) and Kotovena et al. (2002) offer newly calibrated equations for estimating metallicities from photometric data. The former utilizes Strömgren indices

to estimate $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, while the latter employ luminosities (M_v) and Johnson-Cousins $[B - V]$ colors to determine $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ and is specifically formulated for later spectral types ($5.5 < M_v < 7.3$). We used these to calculate photometric $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values for a set of 69 stars with substellar radial velocity (RV) companions for which previous spectroscopic metallicity results exist, using the Kotoneva method for all stars with $M_v > 5.50$, and the Martell/Laughlin equation for all brighter stars. We find a mean offset of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{Spec}} - [\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{Phot}} = 0.10 \pm 0.01$, with a standard deviation of 0.10 between the spectroscopic and photometric estimates. Figure 2 shows the relation of this offset with T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, which reveals no significant trend with any of these parameters. This suggests a zero-point shift in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ between the calibrating spectra of these photometric studies and the spectroscopic studies discussed here.

4.1.2. Surface Gravity and Mass

For an independent check on our $\log g$ and mass estimates, we turn to Allende Prieto & Lambert (1999, hereafter APL99), who utilized the isochrones of Bertelli et al. (1994) and *Hipparcos* data to generate estimates of mass and $\log g$ for just over 17,000 stars within 100 pc of the Sun. Of the 58 SWPs listed in Table 5, 53 are also included in the APL99 sample, allowing us to calculate tables of deviations between our two data sets and examine these differences for trends. We find that both our spectroscopic and theoretical estimates of $\log g$ compare favorably with those of APL99, with the following mean offsets: $\log g_{\text{spec}} - \log g_{\text{APL99}} = -0.01 \pm 0.02$; $\log g_{\text{APL99}} - \log g_{\text{theory}} = 0.03 \pm 0.01$.

Our mass estimates are also in very good agreement with APL99, with a mean difference of $M_{\text{APL99}} - M_{\text{spec}} = \Delta M = -0.04 \pm 0.02 M_{\odot}$. However, we do find a relationship between the deviations in mass estimates and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, which we attribute to the exclusive use of solar metallicity isochrones by APL99. We have derived the following second-order equation to correct for this:

$$\Delta M = 0.2234[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^2 - 0.3023[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] - 0.0095 \quad (1)$$

Provided $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values from other sources are available (e.g. from Strömgren colors, as in Martell & Laughlin (2002)), this correction may be applied to the APL99 data to provide somewhat more accurate estimates of stellar mass.

4.1.3. Effective Temperature

A comparison of our values for T_{eff} with those of APL99 show a mean difference of $T_{\text{eff(spec)}} - T_{\text{eff(phot)}} = -34 \pm 16$ K, with a standard error of 120 K, a reasonable match given

the disparate methods employed and the lower precision of the temperatures reported in that work. Similarly, spectroscopic estimates of T_{eff} available from the Geneva Extrasolar Planet Search Programme website (Santos et al. (2001a), Santos et al. (2002), Perrier et al. (2002)) for 30 of the 31 stars analyzed here are also in close agreement, with a mean difference of -40 ± 10 K and a standard error of 55 K. For further comparisons of our temperature estimates with those of additional spectroscopic studies see Gonzalez (2003).

4.1.4. Age

Independent age estimates based on R'_{HK} values are available for 44 of the 58 stars listed in Table 5 (the remainder either lack published R'_{HK} values or possess highly uncertain spectroscopic ages). Figure 3 shows the deviations between our Padova ages and those based on R'_{HK} estimates as a function of T_{eff} , and we note a distinct trend of relatively lower R'_{HK} age with increasing stellar temperature, in agreement with a systematic offset in R'_{HK} age with spectral type previously noted amongst SWPs by Barnes (2001). Although the $\log R'_{\text{HK}}$ values quoted in Table 5 may not be representative of the true activity levels of the star in question (as such reliability requires observations over several years to account for variability in stellar activity), it is unclear how such observational uncertainties could lead to the trends seen here and amongst the SWPs studied in Barnes (2001). A likely source of systematic offset between the two age estimates may be found in the different isochrone sets used; the R'_{HK} age calibration we employ is from Donahue (1993), which follows the method of Soderblom et al. (1991) who utilized the isochrones of Maeder (1976). In light of these points and those raised by many other studies (c.f. Donahue (1998)), the evidence we present strongly suggests a need to revise the R'_{HK} age calibration.

4.2. Spectroscopic Sample

Potential correlations between the metallicities and other physical characteristics of SWPs have been remarked upon since shortly after the discoveries of these systems (c.f. Paper I, Marcy and Butler (1997)), and more recent studies have pursued these possibilities as the sample of SWPs has grown (Paper VI, Reid (2002), Santos et al. (2002)). We continue this by examining several of these trends below in light of the new data presented, using a “Spectroscopic Sample” of SWPs constructed in the manner of and for the reasons described in Paper VI. Accordingly, it includes only SWPs for which we have derived spectroscopic [Fe/H] values, along with 19 SWPs with parameters from Santos et al. (2002) (owing to the similarity of our methods and results – see above). We further exclude all stars whose

companions have a minimum mass greater than $11 M_J$, as well as seven biased objects, specifically added to Doppler search programs due to their high metallicities: BD -10 3166, HD 2039, HD 4203, HD 30177, HD 73526, HD 76700, HD 108874. Lastly, we have chosen to continue to include in our Spectroscopic Sample HD 192263, whose planetary companion has been challenged by Henry et al. (2002). While we believe the evidence in that work to be compelling, the discovery team of HD 192263 has not yet retracted its findings ⁷; we will, however, make careful note of the presence of HD 192263 in any figures or derived statistical quantities. In sum, these constraints yield a Spectroscopic Sample which contains a total of 71 SWPs.

4.2.1. *Metallicity Distribution*

As first suggested in Paper I, and later confirmed by a number of detailed studies (c.f. Paper VI, Santos et al. (2001a), Reid (2002)), the current population of stars hosting radial velocity companions is metal-rich by ~ 0.25 dex in comparison to similarly selected samples of field stars not known to harbor planetary or brown-dwarf companions (exact values of this offset vary slightly depending on the nature of the SWPs and control samples). The data presented here continue to support this now well-established feature of SWPs, with a mean metallicity of $[Fe/H] = +0.12 \pm 0.02$ for our Spectroscopic Sample, compared with an average $[Fe/H]$ of -0.10 ± 0.03 for the stars-without-planets sample of Santos et al. (2001a). This latter sample shares the same zero point as the larger CORALIE sample presented in Figure 3c of that work, and we compare the distribution of $[Fe/H]$ among our Spectroscopic Sample with the ~ 1000 CORALIE stars in Figure 4.

We do note, however, that while the mean $[Fe/H]$ for SWPs is still significantly higher than that of the general population of stars in the solar neighborhood, it is slightly lower than that of the Spectroscopic Sample studied in Paper VI. This raises the possibility that as the nature of the planets detected by Doppler searches evolves to include both less massive planets and systems with longer orbital periods, the metallicity distribution of SWPs may change as well. We illustrate this in Figure 5, which overplots histograms of metallicities from the 38 stars in the Spectroscopic Sample of Paper VI with those of the 25 SWPs reported here (the updated $[Fe/H]$ values for HD 16141, HD 37124, HD 46375, HD 95128, and HD 117176 are incorporated into the Paper VI histogram data). This may suggest a more subtle relationship between host star metallicity and the periods and/or masses of

⁷Although the same group *has* recently retracted claims of RV companions to HD 13507 and HD 223084 (neither of which have been included in any of our statistical studies).

planetary companions – a possibility we will investigate further below – and is a development which should be monitored closely.

4.2.2. *Young SWPs*

In keeping with our analysis in Paper VI, we have prepared a subsample of SWPs which, in addition to meeting the criteria for inclusion in the Spectroscopic Sample, have spectroscopic age estimates of less than 2.0 Gyr. This sample is shown in Figure 6, where again in analogy with Paper VI we plot $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ against mean Galactocentric distance, R_{M} , relative to the position of the Sun, R_0 , for both young SWPs and a sample of young field stars from Edvardsson et al. (1993) (HD 192263, which is young, but whose status as a SWP is in question, is plotted separately as a square symbol). The dashed line is a least-squares fit to the sample of field stars, and we find that with the exception of HD 130322, all of the SWPs lie above this trend.

In a recent study of the Galactic orbits of SWPs Barbieri & Gratton (2002) find a similar result, in that at any Galactic radius SWPs possess metallicities above the mean of nearby field stars. The authors suggest that this is best explained by a scenario in which the presence of companions is responsible for the observed high metallicities. Although comparisons between our studies are not exact – our young SWPs sample does not have as large a range in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values as the age-independent Barbieri & Gratton study, but suffers less from the effects of orbital diffusion – we do confirm this observational result. However, in contrast to Barbieri & Gratton we also find evidence of a difference in the slope of the metallicity-Galactocentric radius relation between SWPs and the field star sample. Because SWPs are so much more common among metal-rich stars, the trend with Galactocentric radius is observed to be steeper than that amongst the field population. This could be interpreted as supporting a hypothesis in which the high metallicity is responsible for the presence of companions.

4.2.3. *Planetary Characteristics*

Figures 7 and 8 present (respectively) the eccentricities and $M\sin i$ values of the planets in the Spectroscopic Sample, shown in each case as a function of host star metallicity (for SWPs with more than one detected companion, the eccentricity of the innermost planet and the combined $M\sin i$ value of all planets in the system is adopted). In general agreement with Santos et al. (2002), no significant trend is visible for either distribution, although

the upper envelope of each is observed to increase somewhat with higher values of host star $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$.

4.3. The California & Carnegie Planet Search Sample

As discussed at length in Reid (2002), Santos et al. (2001a, 2002), and Gonzalez (2003), investigations of possible uniquely characteristic observational features of SWPs face the difficulty of the lack of a comprehensive, volume-limited control sample. We can mitigate this somewhat by strongly limiting the scope of our query, as in the case of the young SWPs; however, in order to evaluate more global trends among SWPs, we require a more complete understanding of the stars being searched for RV companions. Figure 4 approaches this goal with its comparison of the metallicities of SWPs to the CORALIE sample described in Santos et al. (2001a), but no additional data beyond the relative frequency of stars as a function of metallicity has been published to date on that control sample, rendering further inquiries into other physical characteristics difficult, if not impossible.

Mass is one important property of SWPs not yet examined in detail. In order to determine any potential trend in the masses of SWPs, we prepared a control sample from the list of 889 stars currently under observation by the California and Carnegie Planet Search Program (CCPSP), for which accurate mean RV data has recently been published by Nidever et al. (2002). This set of stars was selected because its detailed publication allows for further investigation of its member stars by additional methods, and its inherent inclusion of those SWPs found by the CCPSP enables ready comparison of those stars discovered to harbor RV companions with similarly studied stars which do not yet show such evidence.

From the initial data set of 889 stars we removed all stars with visual magnitudes fainter than 8.0, the current stated limiting magnitude of the CCPSP, as well as all stars whose *Hipparcos* parallax estimates possessed errors greater than 20% of their nominal value (this latter restriction was made in order to insure the reliability of subsequent estimates of M_v). Additionally, stars with $M_v < 2.0$ and $B - V > 0.90$ were omitted, as were stars with $M_v > 7.73$, in order to restrict the comparison sample to an F, G, and K dwarf subset. This process excluded several subgiant stars from the CCPSP Subsample, but no members of the SWPs cohort. HD 4203, HD 49674, and HD 108874 were also removed as they were added to the CCPSP solely due to their high values of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$. Lastly, we removed an additional 9 stars for which no additional published spectroscopic or photometric data were available to provide estimates of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$. In total, this sample (hereafter, the “CCPSP Subsample”) contains 496 stars, 36 of which have been reported by the CCPSP to host RV companions with minimum masses less than $11 M_J$.

4.3.1. *Metallicities*

We calculated values of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for the CCPSP Subsample using the previously described photometric recipes of Martell & Laughlin (2002) and Kotoneva et al. (2002), employing the Martell/Laughlin equations for all stars brighter than $M_v = 5.5$, and the Kotoneva method for those dimmer. In keeping with our findings of an 0.10 dex offset between these photometric estimates and our spectroscopic results, we added 0.10 dex to the photometric $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values of all stars in the CCPSP Subsample. Figure 9 presents a histogram of the relative contribution of SWPs to the entire CCPSP Subsample as a function of metallicity. As we have seen in similar analyses by other investigators (Santos et al. 2001a, Santos et al. 2002, Reid 2002), a significantly higher fraction of the metal-rich CCPSP Subsample possess RV companions relative to the more metal-poor stars (although the highest metallicity bin shown does suffer somewhat from low number statistics, as there are only 3 stars in the CCPSP Subsample with such high values of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$).

4.3.2. *Stellar Masses*

In order to readily generate mass estimates for the CCPSP Subsample, we performed a multiple linear regression analysis on the M_v , $B - V$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ data points contained within a Padova isochrone set with a fixed age of 3.98 Gyr and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values ranging from -0.38 to $+0.32$ dex. This yielded the following equation relating stellar mass, M_v , $B - V$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$:

$$M/M_\odot = 1.61437 - 0.153824M_v + 0.116028[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] + 0.216553(B - V) \quad (2)$$

We employed equation (2) on the full CCPSP Subsample, and a comparison of the mass values thus generated with those calculated for the same SWPs using the Padova isochrones shows a mean difference of $M_{\text{Spec.Est.}} - M_{\text{LinearEst.}} = -0.01 \pm 0.01 M_\odot$, with a standard deviation of $0.09 M_\odot$. The left panel of Figure 10 presents a histogram distribution of the masses of the CCPSP subsample and the CCPSP SWPs, while the right panel presents the same information as a cumulative frequency distribution. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis of the latter indicates only a 14% probability that the two samples were drawn from the same population, suggesting the presence of a mass bias in the detection of SWPs amongst the full CCPSP Subsample.

There are many potential sources for such biases – for example, given the relatively high mean metallicity of SWPs and the tendency for more massive stars to be younger and therefore more metal-rich. It is plausible that there should be a bias favoring the detection of SWPs around more massive stars. However, the orbital velocity of a star harboring a

companion is an inverse function of that star’s mass, so that for any given companion mass, a more massive host star will be accelerated less by their mutual gravitational attraction, and thus will have a lower orbital velocity with an accordingly lower variability in its measured doppler signal. More precisely, the velocity amplitude goes as $K_{\text{SWPs}} \propto M_{\text{SWPs}}^{-2/3}$ (Cumming et al. 1999). Additionally, more massive stars have fewer absorption lines and are more likely to possess higher rotational speeds, with both factors greatly reducing the probability of detecting the doppler signal from a companion (Bouchy et al. 2001).

Figure 11 attempts to address several of these possible concerns. Each panel presents histograms of the relative contribution of CCPSP SWPs to the full CCPSP Subsample as a function of mass (solid line), as well as mean results from Monte-Carlo simulations (dashed line) with $\sim 20,000$ trial selections of ‘pseudo-SWPs’ samples, each equal in size to the true CCPSP SWPs sample (36 stars). Assuming a Poisson distribution of error in bin membership for the true SWPs, the formal uncertainty in each bin is ≤ 0.04 , while the standard deviations of the Monte-Carlo distributions are ~ 0.02 for all but the extreme upper and lower mass bins, which suffer from low numbers and have uncertainties of ~ 0.10 . Panel (a) presents both distributions with no attempts to correct for any biases; as expected, each bin in the Monte-Carlo distribution contains a ~ 7 percent ‘pseudo-SWPs’ component, in accordance with the overall ratio of SWPs to the full CCPSP Subsample, and the bias suggested by Figure 10 is again evident.

The remaining three panels of Figure 11 consider corrections for possible biases. For panel (b), the true SWPs distribution is the same, but the Monte-Carlo selection process has been altered to force the ‘pseudo-SWPs’ samples to mimic precisely the metallicity distribution observed amongst the true SWPs (i.e., the same number of stars in each metallicity bin). This eliminates from the simulated data those CCPSP stars below $0.7 M_{\odot}$, whose metallicities are lower than any of the observed CCPSP SWPs, but also leads to a large overestimation of the contribution of the high mass stars as compared to the true SWPs distribution. This latter result argues strongly against high $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values as the sole bias in the observed mass function.

Panels (c) and (d) attempt to address the previously mentioned biases against detecting SWPs around higher mass stars. In each case, and for both the observed and simulated data, we compensated for the radial velocity bias by applying a multiplicative correction of $M_{\text{Stellar}}^{2/3}$ to the frequency of SWPs (or ‘pseudo-SWPs’) in each mass bin, resulting in an increase in the relative contribution of stars greater than $1.0 M_{\odot}$ and a decrease in those below $1.0 M_{\odot}$. We note that though this is theoretically precise, it is probably a somewhat overly strong correction for this effect, as the doppler signals of the observed SWPs have relatively high S/N. However, as we make no effort to compensate for the several additional biases

presented against higher mass stars (as they are difficult to directly and reliably quantify as functions of mass), we are confident that this correction as applied offers a reasonable resolution. Panel (c) of Figure 11 presents the mass-bias corrected distributions of both the simulated and observed data, while panel (d) considers both the mass-bias correction as well as the metallicity constraints as applied in panel (b), and therefore represents our best estimate of the ‘true’ mass function.

Evident immediately in all of the plots in Figure 11 is a steep dropoff in the percentage of stars less than $1.0 M_{\odot}$ harboring known RV companions – only 6 SWPs have been detected from the 148 CCPSP Subsample stars less massive than the sun, while 17 SWPs have been found amongst the 152 stars in the CCPSP Subsample with masses between 1.0 and $1.1 M_{\odot}$. The sharp downturns below $0.8 M_{\odot}$ and above $1.3 M_{\odot}$ are also suggestive, but as there are only 36 CCPSP stars in the mass bins at these extremes, even a high estimate of a 10% contribution by SWPs would predict only 1 or 2 SWPs at these masses. While we must emphasize that these suggestive results are only marginally statistically significant at this stage, if any of these trends are indicative of the true mass function of SWPs, they provide very strong constraints on models of planetary system formation and evolution, and impact profoundly the possible distribution of SWPs in the Galaxy.

4.4. Sources of Trends

Gonzalez (2003) summarizes the three currently debated mechanisms for explaining the high $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ seen among SWPs – the *primordial*, *self-enrichment*, and *migration* hypotheses. The trends seen above in the Galactic orbits of SWPs would seem to support the findings of Barbieri & Gratton (2002) favoring the self-enrichment scenario, but the change in the slope of the metallicity-galactocentric distance relationship does suggest some dependence upon the value of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, a prediction of the primordial hypothesis. The latter also finds support in the high metallicity of the subgiants HD 27442, HD 38529, and HD 177830, whose outer convection zones should be deep enough to effectively dilute any reasonable amount of self-enrichment. However, the addition here of several SWPs to the metal-poor subset with $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] < -0.20$ continues to provide a lower limit to any critical metallicity necessary for planet formation.

Figure 12 presents an analysis of our theoretical and spectroscopic $\log g$ values. This offers a possible insight into the self-enrichment scenario, given that a star with an enriched outer convection layer will have a more metal-poor interior than estimated spectroscopically. This results in a lower mass (and therefore $\log g$) estimate than that given by evolutionary models for a star whose outer atmosphere shares the metal abundance of its interior (Ford

et al. 1999). While this effect is small and difficult to reliably detect at the current level of resolution⁸, we note that our spectroscopic $\log g$ estimates are found to be on average higher than our theoretical $\log g$ estimates, in contradiction to this simple model.

The possible trends with SWPs mass seen in Figures 10 and 11 suggest the hypothesis that large, relatively close-orbiting planets may be preferentially found around more massive stars. However, some of this observed distribution of SWPs with stellar mass may be a reflection of the increased probability of finding SWPs orbiting stars with higher $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, as higher mass stars are on average younger, and therefore generally more metal-rich than lower mass stars. We explore this degeneracy in Figure 13, which presents $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ as a function of mass for both the full CCPSP Subsample and the subset of CCPSP SWPs. We note that the *most* metal-rich SWPs are found just above $1.0 M_{\odot}$, not amongst the SWPs with the highest masses, and that there are large numbers of metal-rich, higher mass stars not in the SWPs subset. These points qualitatively argue against metallicity being the sole cause for the observed mass trend; more thorough statistical examinations of the data set as it grows should be performed to properly determine the level to which these two stellar properties bias each other.

If there is in fact a mass dependence on the likelihood of possessing a planetary companion, there are many potential avenues of inquiry to be explored – are massive stars perhaps more likely to suffer the effects of planetary migration via interactions with a more massive disk, or perhaps to directly form through disk instabilities giant planets in < 5 AU orbits? Or are they simply more likely to form more massive, more easily detected planets, or perhaps more planets in general? Answers to these questions will most likely be found via continued searches for planets around stars of various masses, but with similar ages, metallicities, and environmental histories, such as the study of the Hyades by Cochran et al. (2002). The rapidly developing field of modelling planetary system formation may also yield insight into the underlying physical causes of the observed mass trend. Given its potential to powerfully constrain theories of planetary system evolution as well as the overall distribution of SWPs in our Galaxy, we strongly urge research groups to follow up on this preliminary and potentially critical finding.

⁸An 0.2 dex enhancement in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ in the convection layer of 51 Peg, for example, would yield only an 0.05 dex offset in $\log g$.

5. Conclusions and Implications

In this paper we have presented new spectroscopic analyses of 31 SWPs, including 25 SWPs which had not been previously examined in the context of our “Stars-with-Planets” series of papers. Where overlap exists with other, similar research, we find very good agreement between our results on the basic stellar parameters of T_{eff} , $\log g$, and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$. We further utilized our spectroscopic data and the Padova isochrone set to derive ages, masses, and theoretical $\log g$ values for all of the SWPs examined in our series of papers. These data revealed a number of very interesting and unusual stars, including four “red stragglers”: HD 6434, HD 37124, HD 46375, and HD 168746. HD 46375 is particularly unusual, in that it shows evidence of being both very old and very metal-rich. We recommend that these stars be the targets of detailed studies to determine the source(s) of their aberrant physical characteristics.

When we combine the results here with that of our previous work and those of other very similar spectroscopic studies, we find a preponderance of evidence supporting the hypothesis that SWPs are preferentially metal-rich compared to control samples of field stars, as first proposed in Paper I, and additionally confirmed by numerous research efforts (Paper VI, Santos et al. 2001a, Santos et al. 2002, Reid 2002). This observed enhancement in $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ over similar nearby stars is seen at all Galactic radii amongst a subsample of young SWPs, a prediction of the *self-enrichment* model, but also appears to show some dependence on base metallicity, a feature of the *primordial* model (and arguably the *migration* model as well). No strong evidence was found linking stellar $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ to planetary characteristics, however, and a proposed test of the self-enrichment model via discrepancies in determinations of $\log g$ measured through direct spectroscopy and by application of stellar evolutionary models were found to be largely inconclusive. While it is almost certainly the case that there is some minimum primordial metallicity necessary for the formation of a planetary system, and that once formed any planetary system will almost certainly enrich its host star with metals, the degree to which either of these is responsible for the observed metal-rich nature of SWPs remains in question. Pinsonneault et al. (2001) and Santos et al. (2002) provide compelling evidence against widespread self-pollution as the source of the high mean metallicity of SWPs, while Gratton et al. (2001), Murray & Chaboyer (2002), Smith et al. (2002), and Laws & Gonzalez (2001) offer similarly significant evidence supporting non-negligible levels of self-pollution.

Finally, we used a multiple linear regression method and data from Padova isochrones to estimate masses for 496 stars currently targeted for doppler studies by the California & Carnegie Planet Search Program, employing slight recalibrations to the recent photometric studies of Martell & Laughlin (2002) and Kotoneva et al. (2002) to derive necessary

[Fe/H] values. A comparison of this sample with the subset of known SWPs within this group demonstrated both the (expected) trend towards more frequent occurrence of SWPs amongst high metallicity stars, as well as a somewhat increased probability of detection of RV companions in orbit around more massive stars. While this last finding is highly tentative and marginal in its statistical significance, its ramifications are broad and deep. If our results are in fact indicative of the underlying mass function of SWPs, then this strongly constrains models of planetary system formation to prescriptions which preferentially populate stars of higher mass with planets typical of those being discovered by current doppler surveys. Whether the deficit of giant planets around low mass stars is the result of a real physical effect or an artifact of the metallicity trend, the implications for the total number of SWPs in the Galaxy are similar. Given the fact that the overwhelming majority of stars in our Galaxy are less massive than the sun, any tendency for such stars to be without large planetary companions has a profound impact on the total number of planets in our Galaxy. Were it to be the case, as suggested in Wetherill (1994) that such large worlds are necessary for the development of intelligent life in a planetary system, then a lack of these giants around the most common stars in most galaxies may have important implications on estimates of the number of possible harbors of civilizations in the universe.

We would like to thank Kevin Covey for his work on software that greatly aided this analysis, and Tammy Ann Baker Laws for assistance in the preparation of tables. This research has made use of the Simbad database, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France, as well as Jean Schneider's, Geoff Marcy's, and the Geneva Research Group's extrasolar planets web pages. This work has been supported by a the University of Washington Astrobiology Program and a grant from the National Astrobiology Institute. Additionally, Sudhi Tyagi was supported by the Space Grant Program at the University of Washington, and Kyle M. Walker was supported by a Research Experience for Undergraduates grant from Iowa State University.

REFERENCES

- Allende Prieto, C. & Lambert, D. 1999, A&A, 352, 555
- Barbieri, M. & Gratton, R. G. 2002, A&A, 384, 879
- Barnes, S. 2001, AJ, 561, 1095
- Bertelli, G., Bressan, A., Chiosi, C., Fagotto, F. & Nasi E. 1994, A&A, 106S, 275
- Bouchy, F., Pepe, F. & Queloz, D. 1999, A&A, 374, 733
- Butler, R. P. & Marcy, G. W. 1996, ApJ, 464, L153
- Butler, R. P., Vogt, S. S., Marcy, G. W., Fischer, D. A., Henry, G. W., & Apps, K. 2000, ApJ, in press
- Cochran, W. D., Hatzes, A. P. & Paulson, D. B. 2002, AJ, 124, 565
- Cumming, A., Marcy, G. W. & Butler, R. P. 1999, ApJ, 526, 890
- Donahue, R. A. 1993, Ph.D. thesis, New Mexico State Univ.
- Donahue, R. A. 1998, in ASP Conf. Ser. 154, 10th Cambridge Workshop on Cool Stars, Stellar Systems, and the Sun, ed. R. A. Donahue & J. A. Bookbinder (San Francisco:ASP), 1235
- Edvardsson, B., Andersen, J., Gustafsson, B., Lambert, D. L., & Nissen, P. E. et al. 1993, A&A, 275, 101
- ESA 1997, The *Hipparcos* and *Tycho* Catalogue, ESA SP-1200
- Fischer, D. A., Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., Vogt, S. S., & Apps, K. 1999, PASP, 111, 50
- Fischer, D. A., Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., Vogt, S. S., Walp, B., & Apps, K. 2002, PASP, 114, 529
- Ford, E. B., Rasio, F. A., & Sills, A. 1999, ApJ, 514, 411
- Fuhrmann, K., Pfeiffer, M. J. & Bernkopf, J. 1998, A&A, 336, 942
- Girardi, L., Bressan, A., Bertelli, G., & Carraro, G. 2000, *a*, 141S, 371
- Gonzalez, G. 1997, MNRAS, 285, 403 (Paper I)
- Gonzalez, G. 1998, A&A, 334, 221 (Paper II)
- Gonzalez, G. 2003, RMP, 75, 101
- Gonzalez, G. & Vanture, A. D. 1998, A&A, 339, L29 (Paper III)
- Gonzalez, G. & Laws, C. 2000, AJ, 119, 390 (Paper V)
- Gonzalez, G., Wallerstein, G., & Saar, S. H. 1999, ApJ, 511, L111 (Paper IV)
- Gonzalez, G., Laws, C., Tyagi, S., & Reddy, B. E. 2001, AJ, 121, 432 (Paper VI)
- Gratton, R. G., Bonnano, G., Claudi, R. U., Cosentino, R., Desidera, S., Lucatello, S., & Scuderi, S. 2001, A&A, 377, 123
- Hatzes, A., Cochran, W., McArthur, B., Baliunas, S. L., Walker, G., et al. 2000, ApJ, 544, L145

- Henry, T. J., Soderblom, D. R., Donahue, R. A., & Baliunas, S. L. 1996, *AJ*, 111, 439
- Henry, G. W., Butler, R. P., & Vogt, S. S. 2000, *ApJ*, 529, L41
- Henry, G. W., Donahue, R. A., & Baliunas, S. L. 2002, *ApJ*, 577, L111
- Jones, H. R. A., Butler, R. P., Tinney, C. G., Marcy, G. W., Penny, A. J. 2002, *MNRAS*, in press
- Kotoneva, E., Flynn, C., Jimenez, R. 2002, *MNRAS*, 335, 1147
- Laughlin, G. 2000, *ApJ*, 545, 1064L
- Laws, C. & Gonzalez, G. 2001, *ApJ*, 553, 405
- Luhman, K. L. & Jayawardhana, Ray 2002, *ApJ*, 566, 1132L
- Maeder, A. 1976, *A&A*, 47, 389
- Marcy, G. & Butler, R. P. 1996, *ApJ*, 464, L147
- Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., & Vogt, S. S. 2000, *ApJ*, 536, L43
- Martell, S. & Laughlin, G. 2002, *ApJ*, 577L, 45
- Murray, N. & Chaboyer, B. 2002, *ApJ*, 566, 442
- Naef, D., Mayor, M., Pepe, F., Queloz, D., Udry, S., & Burnet, M. 2000a, *Disks, Planetesimals, and Planets*, ed. F. Garzon, C. Eiroo, D. de Winter, & T. J. Mahoney, *ASP Conf. Ser* (San Francisco: ASP), in press
- Naef, D., Mayor, M., Pepe, F., Queloz, D., Santos, N. et al. 2001, *A&A*, 375, 205
- Nidever, D. L., Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., Fischer, D. A., Vogt, S. S. 2002, *ApJS*, 141, 503
- Noyes, R. W., Hartmann, I., Baliunas, S. L., Duncan, D. K. & Vaughan, A. H. 1984, *ApJ*, 279, 763
- Pepe, F., Mayor, M., Galland, F., Naef, D., Queloz, D., et al. 2002, *A&A*, 388, 632
- Perrier, C. et al. 2002, *A&A*, in press.
- Pinsonneault, M. H., DePoy, D. L., & Coffee, M. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, L59
- Reid, I. N. 2002, *PASP*, 114, 306
- Saar, S. H., & Brandenburg, A. 1999, *ApJ*, 524, 295
- Salasnich, B., Girardi, L., Weiss, A., & Chiosi, C. 2000, *A&A*, 361, 1023S
- Santos, N. C., Israelian, G., & Mayor, M. 2000, *A&A*, 363, 228
- Santos, N. C., Israelian, G., & Mayor, M. 2001, *A&A*, 373, 1019
- Santos, N. C., Mayor, M., Naef, D., Pepe, F., Queloz, D., Udry, S., & Burnet, M. 2001, *A&A*, 379, 999
- Santos, N. C., Israelian, G., Mayor, M., Rebolo, R., & Udry, S. 2002, *A&A*, 398, 363
- Schaerer, D., Charbonnel, C., Meynet, G., Maeder, A., & Schaller, G. 1993, *A&AS*, 102, 339
- Schaller, G., Schaefer, D., Meynet, G., & Maeder, A. 1992, *A&AS*, 96, 269
- Sivan, J. P. et al. 2000, *IAU Symposium 202*, in press

- Smith, V., Cunha, K., & Lazzaro, D. 2001, *AJ*, 121, 320
- Soderblom, D., Duncan, D., Johnson, D. 1991, *ApJ*, 375, 722
- Takeda, Y., Sato, B., Kambe, E., Aoki, W., et al. 2001, *PASJ*, 53, 1211
- Udry, S., Mayor, M., & Queloz, D. 2000b, *IAU Symposium* 202
- Udry, S., Mayor, M., Naef, D., Pepe, F., Queloz, D., Santos, N. C. et al. 2002, *A&A*, 390, 26
- Vogt, S. S., Marcy, G. W., Butler, R. P., & Apps, K. 2000, *ApJ*, 536, 902
- Vogt, S. S., Butler, R. P., Marcy, G. W., Fischer, D., Pourbaix, D. et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 568, 362
- Wetherill, G. W. 1994, *Ap&SS*, 212, 23
- Zhao, G., Chen, Y. Q., Qiu, H. M., & Li, Z. W. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 2224
- Zucker, S. & Mazeh, T. 2000, *ApJ*, 531, L67

6. FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1.— H-R diagrams of 4 SWPs with “red straggler” characteristics are shown. Crosshairs in each plot are centered on values for M_v and $\log T_{\text{eff}}$ given in the text, with dimensions equal to quoted $1 - \sigma$ uncertainties. Padova isochrones for ages of 14.1 Gyr (solid line), 15.8 Gyr (dashed line), and 17.8 Gyr (dot-dashed line) are overplotted for the following metallicities: HD 6434, -0.38 ; HD 37124, -0.38 ; HD 46375, $+0.32$; HD 168746, $+0.00$.

Fig. 2.— Differences between Spectroscopic and Photometric estimates of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, shown as functions of T_{eff} (upper panel), $\log g$ (middle panel), and Spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ (lower panel).

Fig. 3.— Differences between SWPs ages derived using the Padova isochrone set and ages calculated with the R'_{HK} calibration, shown as a function of T_{eff} .

Fig. 4.— The relative frequency of SWPs (dashed line) and field stars (solid line) amongst the at varying metallicities. The SWPs are from the Spectroscopic Sample and consist of 71 stars hosting radial velocity companions with spectroscopic $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values measured by our group or by the Geneva group (see text for references), and companion masses below $11 M_J$. Seven SWPs, listed in the text, are omitted from this comparison, as they were specifically added to radial-velocity programs because of their suspected high metallicity. The questionable SWP HD 192263 is included, and contributes 1.5% to the $-0.10 < [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] < 0.00$ bin. The field star sample consists of ~ 1000 stars with metallicities determined by CORALIE (see fig. 3c of Santos et al. 2001a).

Fig. 5.— A comparison of the metallicity distribution of the SWPs samples presented in Paper VI (solid line) and here (dashed line). Five stars reported on in Paper VI (see Table 4) and re-analyzed in the current work are shown as members of the Paper VI sample, but with their updated $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values.

Fig. 6.— $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ vs. mean Galactocentric distance, R_M , relative to the position of the Sun, R_0 , for SWPs (crosses) with Padova age estimates less than 2.0 Gyr and a sample of field stars from Edvardsson et al. (1993) meeting the same age criterion (dots). HD 192263, whose SWP status is in question, is plotted separately as a square symbol here and in the following two figures. The dashed line is a least-squares fit to the sample of field stars.

Fig. 7.— Eccentricity of planetary orbits versus host star $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for the 71 SWPs in the Spectroscopic Sample (for SWPs with more than one detected companion, the eccentricity of the innermost planet in the system is adopted).

Fig. 8.— Mass of planetary companions ($M \sin i$) versus host star $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for the 71 SWPs in

the Spectroscopic Sample (for SWPs with more than one detected companion, the combined $M \sin i$ value for all planets in the system is adopted).

Fig. 9.— The relative contribution as a function of metallicity of the CCPSP subsample of 36 SWPs to the full CCPSP Subsample of 496 stars (all drawn from the larger CCPSP target list of Nidever et al. (2002)). Formal uncertainties assuming a Poisson distribution of error in binning are $\pm 0.04\%$ in each bin. The exceptional value centered on $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.55$ is the result of one SWP discovered amongst the only three CCPSP stars with such high metallicities.

Fig. 10.— The distribution of masses amongst the entire CCPSP Subsample (dashed line) and the subset of SWPs contained therein (solid line), shown in histogram form in the left panel and as a cumulative frequency plot in the right panel. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the two distributions indicate a 14% probability that they are drawn from the same population.

Fig. 11.— The relative contribution as a function of mass of the 36 SWPs in the CCPSP Subsample compared to the full CCPSP Subsample of 496 stars (solid line). Overplotted are results from Monte Carlo simulations of the mass distributions (dashed line, see text for details). Panel (a) – raw distribution of observed and simulated SWPs mass data; Panel (b) – raw distribution of observed SWPs and metallicity constrained simulated data; Panel (c) – mass-bias corrected distribution for both observed and simulated SWPs; Panel (d) – same as panel (c), but also including the same metallicity constraints for the simulated data, as applied in panel (b). Formal uncertainties in the observed SWPs mass data, assuming a Poisson distribution of error in binning, are ± 0.04 in each bin. Standard deviations of each bin in the simulated data are ± 0.02 in all but the extreme upper and lower mass bins, which have uncertainties of ~ 0.10 owing to low number statistics.

Fig. 12.— Deviations between theoretical and spectroscopic estimates of $\log g$ as a function of spectroscopic $\log g$ for the 58 SWPs in Table 5.

Fig. 13.— Photometric $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ as a function of stellar mass for 496 stars in the CCPSP Subsample (crosses) and the 36 members of the SWPs subset (filled circles). Dashed lines represent approximate selection boundaries, following the M_V and color cutoffs of the CCPSP Subsample described in section 4.3.

Table 1. Observing Log

Star (HD)	UT Date (mm/dd/yy)	Observatory	Wavelength Range (Å)	Resolving Power	S/N ^a (per pixel)	Observer code ^b	Discovery code ^c
82943	12/14/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	63,000	375	CL	1
33636	12/14/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	63,000	340	CL	1, 2
22049	12/14/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	63,000	240	CL	3
4208	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	325	CL	2
190228	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	360	CL	4
1951019A	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	300	CL	5
16141	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	320	CL	6
46375	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	350	CL	6
37124	12/15/2000	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	62,000	300	CL	7
213240	04/06/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	320	NS	8
108147	04/06/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	260	NS	9
121504	04/06/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	265	NS	1
160691	04/05/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	230	NS	10
169830	04/05/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	225	NS	11
83443	04/06/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	280	NS	12
27442	04/06/2001	CTIO 4-m	5850-8950	35,000	195	NS	13
4203	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	250	CL,GG	2
8574	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	405	CL,GG	1
19994	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	620	CL,GG	1
28185	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	245	CL,GG	8
50554	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	390	CL,GG	1
68988	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	250	CL,GG	2
95128	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	550	CL,GG	14
117176	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	335	CL,GG	15
106252	12/02/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	295	CL,GG	1
6434	12/03/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	450	CL,GG	1
114783	12/03/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	225	CL,GG	2
202206	12/03/2001	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	60,000	320	CL,GG	16
141937	03/25/2002	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	59,000	355	CL	16
136118	03/25/2002	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	59,000	385	CL	17
168746	03/25/2002	McD 2.7-m	3700-10000	59,000	230	CL	9

^aThe S/N ratio corresponds to the value near 6700 Å.

^bThe observer codes correspond to the following observers: CL, Chris Laws; GG, Guillermo Gonzalez; NS, Nicholas Suntzeff

^cThe discoverer codes correspond to the following studies: 1, Unpublished, Geneva Group

Table 2. Measured Equivalent Widths for McDonald 2.7m Data

Species	$\lambda_o(\text{\AA})$	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD
These tables are available upon the request.								

Table 3. Measured Equivalent Widths for CTIO 4m Data

Species	$\lambda_o(\text{\AA})$	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD	HD
These tables are available on request.								

Table 4. Spectroscopically-Determined Physical Parameters of all Program Stars

Star (HD)	T_{eff} (K)	$\log g$	ξ_t (km s ⁻¹)	[Fe/H]	N(Fe I,II)
4203	5587 ± 54	4.15 ± 0.08	1.05 ± 0.06	$+0.40 \pm 0.04$	63, 9
4208	5586 ± 34	4.39 ± 0.04	0.69 ± 0.10	-0.25 ± 0.03	56, 8
6434	5705 ± 84	4.21 ± 0.10	0.67 ± 0.13	-0.55 ± 0.07	61, 8
8574	6034 ± 33	4.19 ± 0.11	1.10 ± 0.07	$+0.02 \pm 0.03$	66, 9
16141 ^a	5801 ± 31	4.24 ± 0.04	1.01 ± 0.05	$+0.19 \pm 0.03$	60, 8
19994	6164 ± 47	4.22 ± 0.07	1.82 ± 0.11	$+0.14 \pm 0.04$	65, 9
22049	5086 ± 50	4.41 ± 0.11	0.90 ± 0.09	-0.09 ± 0.03	61, 8
27442	4797 ± 101	3.27 ± 0.23	1.20 ± 0.13	$+0.41 \pm 0.05$	48, 8
28185	5670 ± 30	4.54 ± 0.05	0.94 ± 0.06	$+0.24 \pm 0.02$	65, 9
33636	5930 ± 33	4.29 ± 0.07	1.01 ± 0.10	-0.11 ± 0.03	58, 8
37124 ^a	5551 ± 34	4.43 ± 0.07	0.60 ± 0.18	-0.37 ± 0.03	59, 8
46375 ^a	5241 ± 44	4.41 ± 0.09	0.69 ± 0.11	$+0.30 \pm 0.03$	60, 8
50554	5984 ± 31	4.37 ± 0.05	1.04 ± 0.09	$+0.02 \pm 0.02$	64, 9
68988	5922 ± 57	4.40 ± 0.06	1.08 ± 0.07	$+0.34 \pm 0.04$	65, 9
82943	6008 ± 34	4.43 ± 0.06	1.01 ± 0.07	$+0.26 \pm 0.03$	56, 8
83443	5389 ± 66	4.36 ± 0.13	0.81 ± 0.12	$+0.36 \pm 0.04$	57, 8
95128 ^b	5861 ± 30	4.29 ± 0.06	1.01 ± 0.07	$+0.05 \pm 0.02$	66, 9
106252	5852 ± 31	4.39 ± 0.05	0.97 ± 0.09	-0.05 ± 0.03	64, 8
108147	6316 ± 91	4.58 ± 0.15	0.99 ± 0.18	$+0.23 \pm 0.06$	56, 8
114783	5130 ± 43	4.50 ± 0.09	0.94 ± 0.08	$+0.17 \pm 0.02$	66, 8
117176 ^b	5530 ± 45	3.99 ± 0.05	1.05 ± 0.05	-0.02 ± 0.04	66, 9
121504	5941 ± 74	4.37 ± 0.08	1.00 ± 0.18	$+0.12 \pm 0.05$	55, 8
136118	6231 ± 50	4.29 ± 0.08	1.96 ± 0.22	-0.05 ± 0.03	62, 8
141937	5856 ± 49	4.44 ± 0.08	0.96 ± 0.06	$+0.14 \pm 0.04$	67, 9
160691	5811 ± 45	4.42 ± 0.06	1.07 ± 0.08	$+0.28 \pm 0.03$	48, 5
168746	5577 ± 44	4.38 ± 0.05	0.93 ± 0.06	-0.06 ± 0.03	66, 8
169830	6312 ± 50	4.15 ± 0.06	1.26 ± 0.13	$+0.17 \pm 0.04$	48, 6
190228	5276 ± 36	3.51 ± 0.06	0.99 ± 0.05	-0.24 ± 0.03	61, 8
195019A	5734 ± 32	4.09 ± 0.10	1.10 ± 0.05	$+0.03 \pm 0.03$	60, 7
202206	5716 ± 38	4.43 ± 0.06	0.98 ± 0.06	$+0.33 \pm 0.03$	66, 9
213240	6086 ± 83	4.51 ± 0.16	1.00 ± 0.13	$+0.23 \pm 0.06$	51, 8

^aThese stars were previously analyzed using more limited Keck spectra in Paper VI.

^bThese stars were previously analyzed using more limited McDonald 2.1m spectra in Paper II.

Table 5. Derived Parameters of all Program Stars

Star (HD)	M_V^a	Age ^b (Gyr)	Mass ^b ($M_\odot$)	$\log g_{\text{evol}}^b$	U, V, W ^c (km s ⁻¹)	$\log R'_{\text{HK}}^d$	Age ^e (Gyr)
4203	4.24 ± 0.21	7.6 ± 0.7	1.05 ± 0.03	4.15 ± 0.10	-17.9,-36.3,+2.7	-5.13	8.7
4208	5.22 ± 0.08	11.7 ± 0.8	0.84 ± 0.02	4.41 ± 0.03	-42.5,+1.1,-51.8	-4.93	4.3
6434	4.69 ± 0.08	> 17	0.80 ± 0.04	4.25 ± 0.05	+95.2,-6.1,+3.4	-4.89	3.7
8574	3.90 ± 0.16	see text	see text	see text	-34.1,-30.7,-24.9	...	...
16141	4.05 ± 0.11	3.2 ± 0.2	1.18 ± 0.02	4.20 ± 0.03	+94.5,-35.2,+7.5	-5.05	6.7
19994	3.32 ± 0.04	2.9 ± 0.1	1.34 ± 0.02	4.09 ± 0.03	-10.5,-13.5,-0.9	-4.84	3.1
22049	6.19 ± 0.01	$2.0^{+3.0}_{-2.0}$	0.81 ± 0.03	4.58 ± 0.04	+6.4,+13.1,-14.6	-4.47	0.7
27442	3.14 ± 0.02	3.2 ± 0.2	1.40 ± 0.07	3.42 ± 0.09	+25.1,-16.1,-13.2	...	...
28185	4.81 ± 0.09	4.0 ± 1.0	1.03 ± 0.02	4.20 ± 0.02	-23.6,-28.8,-17.4	-4.82	2.9
33636	4.71 ± 0.08	2.5 ± 1.5	1.03 ± 0.02	4.42 ± 0.03	+9.5,-24.2,+14.8	-4.81	2.8
37124	5.07 ± 0.08	> 18	0.77 ± 0.02	4.33 ± 0.15	+42.7,-40.1,-37.3	-4.90	3.9
46375	5.29 ± 0.08	16.5 ± 3.5	0.87 ± 0.02	4.34 ± 0.10	+20.3,-13.4,+14.9	-4.94	4.5
50554	4.38 ± 0.07	3.9 ± 0.7	1.08 ± 0.02	4.36 ± 0.02	+13.7,-4.0,-5.5	-4.94	4.5
68988	4.35 ± 0.12	1.6 ± 1.5	1.18 ± 0.04	4.37 ± 0.05	+85.0,-15.8,-3.8	-5.07	7.1
82943	4.35 ± 0.05	0.6 ± 0.5	$1.18^{+0.05}_{-0.01}$	4.39 ± 0.02	+20.2,-13.9,-2.9	-4.95	4.7
83443	5.04 ± 0.08	10.7 ± 1.3	0.93 ± 0.01	4.31 ± 0.10	+29.9,-24.7,-6.0	-4.85	3.2
95128	4.29 ± 0.03	6.8 ± 0.3	1.05 ± 0.01	4.25 ± 0.02	-14.0,+3.6,+6.6	-5.26	12.7
106252	4.54 ± 0.07	6.8 ± 0.5	1.00 ± 0.01	4.34 ± 0.03	+38.5,-37.6,+6.5	-4.97	5.0
108147	4.06 ± 0.06	< 1.0	1.23 ± 0.03	4.36 ± 0.04	-20.3,-5.4,-8.3	-4.72	2.0
114783	6.02 ± 0.05	< 4.5	0.88 ± 0.03	4.54 ± 0.03	-5.4,+3.3,-2.9	-4.96	4.8
117176	3.68 ± 0.03	7.9 ± 0.4	1.05 ± 0.02	3.92 ± 0.05	+23.2,-45.9,+2.2	-4.74	see text
121504	4.30 ± 0.09	$4.0^{+1.0}_{-1.5}$	1.11 ± 0.02	4.30 ± 0.08	-17.8,-45.9,+4.0	-4.81	2.8
136118	3.34 ± 0.09	3.2 ± 0.2	1.28 ± 0.01	4.08 ± 0.04	-10.9,-10.2,+23.0	-4.88	3.6
141937	4.63 ± 0.08	$2.5^{+1.0}_{-1.5}$	1.08 ± 0.02	4.41 ± 0.02	+13.0,+19.3,-2.6	-4.65	1.6
160691	4.20 ± 0.03	4.5 ± 0.4	1.14 ± 0.01	4.25 ± 0.04	-3.7,-2.4,+1.9	-5.02	6.0
168746	4.78 ± 0.09	14.8 ± 1.0	0.89 ± 0.02	4.21 ± 0.10	-9.4,-16.1,+2.8	...	...
169830	3.10 ± 0.07	2.3 ± 0.2	1.41 ± 0.02	4.07 ± 0.02	-7.1,+2.5,+7.5	-4.93	4.3
190228	3.33 ± 0.11	4.5 ± 0.2	1.23 ± 0.03	3.68 ± 0.10	-10.0,-41.0,-29.9	...	...
195019A	4.01 ± 0.07	8.7 ± 0.4	1.04 ± 0.01	4.09 ± 0.05	-62.0,-69.7,-31.4	-4.85	3.2
202206	4.75 ± 0.11	1.7 ± 1.5	1.10 ± 0.05	4.41 ± 0.02	+32.5,-13.3,-3.9	...	...
213240	3.76 ± 0.07	2.9 ± 0.4	1.25 ± 0.01	4.21 ± 0.02	+35.1,-24.2,+29.3	-4.80	2.7
1237	5.36 ± 0.02	0.7 ± 0.7	0.99 ± 0.02	4.51 ± 0.01	-23.1,-10.4,+8.4	-4.27	< 0.1
9826	3.45 ± 0.02	3.1 ± 0.3	1.30 ± 0.01	4.11 ± 0.04	+38.8,-16.5,-8.2	-4.97	5.0
10697	3.71 ± 0.06	6.9 ± 0.4	1.12 ± 0.02	3.98 ± 0.05	+46.7,-22.2,+23.0	-5.02	see text
12661	4.58 ± 0.07	3.6 ± 0.8	1.08 ± 0.01	4.34 ± 0.03	+61.7,-23.5,+3.7	-5.12	8.4
17051	4.22 ± 0.02	0.5 ± 0.5	1.20 ± 0.02	4.38 ± 0.02	-21.2,-11.4,-2.8	-4.65	1.6
22532	3.81 ± 0.02	2.2 ± 0.2	1.42 ± 0.05	3.72 ± 0.02	-2.5,-10.1,-22.2	-4.22	< 0.1

Table 5—Continued

Star (HD)	M_V^a	Age ^b (Gyr)	Mass ^b ($M_\odot$)	$\log g_{\text{evol}}^b$	U, V, W ^c (km s ⁻¹)	$\log R'_{\text{HK}}^d$	Age ^e (Gyr)
145675	5.32 ± 0.02	$9.8^{+7.1}_{-4.8}$	0.87 ± 0.05	4.36 ± 0.06	+33.9, -6.1, -10.1	-5.07	7.1
168443	4.03 ± 0.07	9.3 ± 0.6	1.03 ± 0.02	4.02 ± 0.04	-19.8, -51.7, -0.7	-5.08	7.4
177830	3.32 ± 0.10	3.5 ± 0.4	1.38 ± 0.05	3.55 ± 0.06	-13.2, -64.4, -1.2	-5.28	see text
186427	4.60 ± 0.02	9.1 ± 0.8	0.98 ± 0.01	4.30 ± 0.04	+27.6, -24.4, +4.1	...	...
187123	4.43 ± 0.07	5.0 ± 0.6	1.07 ± 0.01	4.32 ± 0.03	+12.6, -9.3, -37.4	...	...
192263 ^g	6.30 ± 0.05	see text	~ 0.76	~ 4.54	-6.1, +16.9, +25.7	-4.37	0.3
209458	4.29 ± 0.10	$2.4^{+1.1}_{-1.9}$	1.12 ± 0.02	4.36 ± 0.04	+4.3, -9.6, +6.6	-4.93	4.3
210277	4.90 ± 0.04	$8.1^{+1.9}_{-2.9}$	0.98 ± 0.03	4.35 ± 0.02	+14.0, -44.2, -0.3	-5.06	6.9
217014	4.52 ± 0.02	4.3 ± 1.0	1.07 ± 0.01	4.35 ± 0.02	-5.2, -23.6, +21.6	-5.07	7.1
217107	4.70 ± 0.03	6.3 ± 1.3	1.02 ± 0.02	4.31 ± 0.02	+8.5, -2.5, +16.4,	-5.00	5.6
222582	4.57 ± 0.10	8.7 ± 0.8	0.98 ± 0.02	4.32 ± 0.03	+46.7, +5.4, -5.1	-5.00	5.6

^aCalculated from the *Hipparcos* parallaxes.

^bDerived from Padova Stellar Isochrones (Salasnich et al. 2000).

^cSpace velocities are relative to the Local Standard of Rest (LSR). The assumed solar motion with respect to the LSR is (U, V, W) = (10, 6, 6) km s⁻¹. Positive U directed toward the Galactic center.

^d R'_{HK} values are taken from the corresponding discovery papers listed in the Introduction, except HD75332 (Saar & Brandenburg, 1999), HD83443 (Butler et al., 2002), and HD22049 (Henry et al., 1996).

^eCalculated from the R'_{HK} values and Henry et al.’s (1996) equation, which is taken originally from Donahue (1993).

^fHD75332 is not known to harbor a planet, but is included in this table for a complete comparison with Table 14 of Paper VI.

^gThe existence of the planet orbiting HD192263 has recently been questioned by Henry et al. (2002).

























